



Attorney Docket No. P5410
Client/Matter No. 80168.0118
Express Mail No. EL961393800US

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

In re Application of:

WEIL et al.

Serial No.: 09/754,155

Filed: January 4, 2001

For: **SEARCH ENGINE INTERFACE
AND METHOD OF
CONTROLLING CLIENT
SEARCHES**

Confirmation No. 3195

Art Unit: 2172

Examiner: Chongshan Chen

Customer No. **32658**

Docket No. P5410

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RECEIVED

FEB 09 2004

Technology Center 2100

APPELLANTS' BRIEF UNDER 37 CFR 1.192

I. Real Party in Interest

Sun Microsystems, Inc.
4120 Network Circle
Santa Clara, CA 95054
USA

II. Related Appeals and Interferences

No other appeals or interferences are currently known to Appellants that will directly affect, be directly affected by, or have a bearing on the decision to be rendered by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in the present appeal.

III. Status of Claims

Claims 1-20 and 22 are pending in the application. Original claim 21 was canceled. No claims have been allowed.

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,327,590 to Chidlovskii in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,366,915 to Rubert. Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chidlovskii in view of Rubert and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,360,215 to Judd. Claims 7-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,253,198 to Perkins in view of Rubert. Claims 14-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Judd in view of Rubert. Claim 22 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chidlovskii. On December 24, 2003, Appellants appealed from the final rejection by filing a Notice of Appeal of all pending claims, i.e., claims 1-20 and 22.

IV. Status of Amendments

In response to the Final Office Action mailed September 16, 2003, Appellants provided in an Amendment dated November 14, 2003 remarks and arguments that addressed the rejection of all pending claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103 and attempted to add new claims 23 and 24 that depended from claim 1. In an Advisory Action mailed December 9, 2003, the Examiner indicated that the request for reconsideration was considered and that the arguments were not found to be persuasive. The Advisory Action did not indicate whether the claim amendment was entered, and for the sake of this Appeal, Appellants are assuming that new dependent claims 23 and 24 were not entered and are not pending at this time.

All claim amendments other than the addition of claims 23 and 24 have been entered, and claims 1-20 and 22 remain in the application for consideration in this Appeal.

V. Summary of the Invention

Briefly, the invention is directed toward methods and systems for restricting direct access to content files by a search engine and by clients during searches initiated by the client and controlled by the search engine. As stated in Appellants' specification at page 3, lines 24-29, the problem being addressed by the invention is that prior "Web servers and search engines generally do not function to restrict a searcher's access to content based on the searcher's information (e.g., paid enrollment, paid subscription, security clearances and the like)" but instead "access to content is provided on an all or nothing basis." As noted in the specification at page 4, lines 5-9 in describing prior devices, "once access is granted to the Web server, the searcher . . . has access to all of the content serviced by the Web server and its associated search engine." The invention addresses this problem by controlling access by a search engine to content files during spidering or indexing operations used in building search engine collections and by controlling access by clients to search engine collections.

With reference to Figures 1 and 2, a search control system 100 is provided in which clients 104 attempt to access information in content files 150 via the Internet 120 by submitting search requests to a server 130. The server 130 includes a search engine interface 136, which functions as the restrictive layer between clients 104 and a search engine 160. Further, the search engine interface 136 blocks direct access by the clients 104 to the search engine collections 166 (and, the content files 150) by modifying search requests to create modified search requests. The search engine interface 136 may also block direct access by the search engine 160 to the content files 150 by intercepting indexing requests of the search engine and modifying the requests and/or the indexing or spidering results. See, page 10, line 4 to page 11, line 7 for further explanation of the access control function of the search engine interface 136.

More particularly, to control access to the content files 150, the search engine interface 136 is positioned between the client 104 and the search engine 160 and is

also positioned between the search engine 160 and the content files 150. During operation of the system 100, the search engine interface 136 receives an indexing request 250 from the search engine 160 for a set of information from the content files 150 to populate search engine collections 166. The search engine interface 136 operates to retrieve the requested set of information and to then modify the retrieved information, which is then passed to the search engine 160 in an indexing reply 270 that is used to populate the search engine collections 166. In one embodiment, the search engine interface 136 acts to modify the indexing request 250 and then, calls and gathers the requested information in an indexing communication. In this way, the search engine interface 136 functions to limit or control access to the content files 150 by tightly controlling the populating of the search engine collections 166 (i.e., the information that is later searched by the engine 160 in response to a search request from the client 104), rather than providing the search engine 160 full and direct access to the content files 150 as occurs with prior Web servers.

The search engine interface 136 also functions to restrict access by clients 104 to the search engine collections 166, thereby providing two techniques of controlling user access to the content files 150 that can be used independently or in combination to provide a desired level of data access control. During operation, the search engine interface 136 receives a search request 210 from a client 104. In response, the interface 136 creates or retrieves a client search profile 214, which may include data collection keywords, tag labels, or other user-based information. Then, the search engine interface 136 modifies the search request 210 to create a modified search request 220, which is constructed to limit the client's search access. The modified search request 220 is passed to the search engine 160, which responds by performing a search of its collections 166 based on the modified request 220 and returns the search results 230 to the search engine interface 136. The search engine interface 136 then parses the results to place them in an expected or standardized form and returns the results 240 to the requesting client 104. The interface 136 limits access by the client 104 to content files 150 in a manner that is transparent to the user of the client

device 104 as the user inputs a standard search request 210 and receives standardized search results 240.

VI. Issues

1. Whether claims 1-5 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Chidlovskii (U.S. Patent No. 6,327,590) in view of Rubert (U.S. Patent No. 6,366,915).
2. Whether claim 6 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Chidlovskii in view of Rubert and further in view of Judd (U.S. Patent No. 6,360,215).
3. Whether claims 7-13 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Perkins (U.S. Patent No. 6,253,198) in view of Rubert.
4. Whether claims 14-20 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Judd in view of Rubert.
5. Whether claim 22 is unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Chidlovskii.

VII. Grouping of Claims

The following groups of claims have been rejected by the Examiner. Claims 11 and 12 of Group III stand or fall separately from the other claims of Group III but otherwise, the claim or claims within each group stand or fall together. The reasons why Appellants believe claims 11 and 12 are separately patentable are explained below in the Argument.

Rejection under 103(a):

- | | |
|-------------------|--------------|
| <u>Group I:</u> | claims 1-5; |
| <u>Group II:</u> | claim 6; |
| <u>Group III:</u> | claims 7-13; |

Group IV: claims 14-20; and

Group V: claim 22.

VIII. Argument

A. Rejection of Claims 1-5 under 103(a) based on Chidlovskii in View of Rubert is Improper

Claim 1 is directed to a method for controlling access provided to a client to content files. The method comprises “creating a modified search request by applying a search profile for the client to the received search request” and “wherein the applying of the search profile includes adding at least a portion of the search profile to the received request to specify a set of the search engine collections to be searched by the search engine with the modified search request.” Each of these limitations is not taught or suggested by the combination of Chidlovskii and Rubert, and hence, claim 1 is not made obvious by these references.

In the Final Office Action on page 5, the Examiner stated “Chidlovskii does not disclose wherein the applying of the search profile includes adding at least a portion of the search profile to the received search request to specify a set of the search engine collections to be searched by the search engine with the modified search request.” However, in the Response to Arguments on line 2 of page 3, the Final Office Action and Advisory Action assert that “Rubert also teaches determining which databases to search according to the user information.” However, Rubert is cited at Figure 4, elements 410 and 415, col. 2, lines 61-64, and Rubert at this citation and elsewhere fails to teach the limitation of claim 1 of “adding at least a portion of the search profile to the received request to specify a set of the search engine collections to be searched by the search engine.” Combining the teachings of these two references would not result in the claimed invention as Rubert does not overcome the admitted deficiencies of Chidlovskii, and claim 1 is allowable over Chidlovskii and Rubert.

Specifically, Rubert at Figure 4 item 410, is teaching a step of receiving notification of a user identity but not of adding a portion of a profile to a search

request to set which databases can be accessed by the user. Instead, turning to col. 2, lines 61-66, Rubert teaches a system using a user's identification to identify which databases can be accessed by the user and which queries can be executed. The Rubert system then "presents the user with available queries" and the user must select one of the queries.

Nothing in Rubert explicitly or implicitly suggests that the user is submitting a search request that is modified by adding something from the profile, but instead, the profile is used to identify the databases and how they may be queried – these are different processes. This can be seen at various locations in Rubert such as: (1) col. 4, line 3, "provides an interface with which the user can easily specify a query"; (2) col. 4, line 40, "the IR system then presents the user with these queries"; (3) col. 4, line 55, "After the user has finished specifying the query, the IR system then executes the query"; and (4) col. 5, line 53, "authorized report forms for Bob are shown in UI screen 100."

Rubert's teachings when applied in the context of Appellants' invention would suggest to one skilled in the art that access to the content files 150 is requested and in response sets of the content files 150 are offered to the requestor along with a set of acceptable queries. Instead, the invention of claim 1 calls for allowing the user to define the search request as a free search but then, a portion of a profile is added to define which search engine collections are accessed. Rubert's teaching when combined with the teaching of Chidlovskii would not successfully lead to the claimed invention. Therefore, claim 1 is non-obvious in light of the combined teachings of these two references and is allowable over Chidlovskii in view of Rubert.

The Response to Arguments portion of the Final Office Action further asserts that Chidlovskii teaches creating a modified search request with its language regarding applying a predetermined context profile to the search query "to generate a context of the search query." The Final Office Action then argues that this "context" is used to determine the community or set of communities to search. However,

Chidlovskii in Figure 2 only shows one community document collection 70 and several search engines 20, and at col. 2, lines 33-50, Chidlovskii indicates that terms of the search query are compared to the user's context profile to determine a context but then the search engine(s) are "responsive to the search query" to generate search results.

There is no teaching that anything from the context profile is added to the search query or that the search query is modified in any way prior to its use by the search engines. Instead, the "context" is used later by the post-processor 40 to rank items returned by the search engine based on "the" search query (see, col. 2, lines 55-64). Chidlovskii teaches a method of processing results of a search but not how to control access to search engine collections (which, in fact, are not discussed in Chidlovskii, which indicates that the search query originally submitted to the user is applied to all of the search engine collections).

In the Advisory Action, Chidlovskii is cited at col. 5, lines 42-55 for teaching modifying a search request with a user profile. However, again, Chidlovskii is discussing how it creates "user profiles" for later use by the post-processor 40 and is not teaching modification of search requests by profile information to control search access. Chidlovskii describes in detail how the "context" profile or user profile is utilized for post processing from col. 5, line 56 to col. 10, line 18, with highlights of how documents within a collection may be ranked to assist future search results. Because Chidlovskii does not teach creating a modified search request based on a user profile, Chidlovskii does not teach or suggest the invention of claim 1.

Claims 2-5 depend from claim 1 and are believed allowable as depending from an allowable base claim.

B. Rejection of Claim 6 under 103(a) based on Chidlovskii in View of Rubert Further in View of Judd is Improper

Claim 6 depends from claim 1 and further calls for "prior to the receiving of the search request, intercepting an indexing request from the search engine for a set of

information from the content for the search engine collections and in response, returning to the search engine a modified form of the requested set of information.” The method, hence, restricts a search engine’s building of its search collections, which are later used by the search engine for responding to a search request from a client, e.g., the search engine does not typically directly search the content but instead searches the indexed collections.

The Final Office Action at page 6, states that Chidlovskii and Rubert do not disclose “prior to the receiving of the search request, intercepting an indexing request from the search engine for a set of information from the content for the search engine collections and in response, returning to the search engine a modified form of the requested set of information” and then argues that Judd teaches this limitation at Figure 1. However, in the Response to Arguments, the Final Office Action cites Chidlovskii with the identical citation used for claim 1 and no further discussion of Judd is provided in the Response to Arguments. As discussed with respect to claim 1, Chidlovskii provides no teaching of building and using search engine collections, and particularly, search engine collections that are limited by returning a modified forms of requested sets of information to search engine indexing requests. Therefore, Chidlovskii fails to teach the limitation of claim 6, and this is consistent with the Office Action statement on page 6.

Further, the Office Action of April 11, 2003 failed to address Applicant’s remarks distinguishing Judd from claim 6. As of the filing of this Appeal, the Examiner had failed to indicate that the Office carefully considered or to respond to the following arguments distinguishing Judd from claim 6 that had been provided in Appellants’ last three responses:

After reviewing Judd at Fig. 1 and at col. 5., line 62 to col. 8, line 29 where Fig. 1 is described, Applicant could find no teaching or suggestion that it may be desirable to intercept a search engine indexing or populating request by retrieving the requested data from a content store but yet returning a modified

version of the retrieved data. This is useful for controlling how the search engine collections is populated (i.e., limiting access to content by the search engines), and thus, limiting access by clients who later submit search requests as the collection is different than the raw information in the content store. Claim 6 is believed allowable for this additional reason over the combination of Chidlovskii, Rubert, and Judd.

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner addressed the above argument by citing Judd at Fig. 2B, elements 222 and 224 with reference to col. 5, line 62 to col. 10, line 58. However, Judd simply describes with reference to method steps 222 and 224 that a next document to be indexed is retrieved at 222 and then at 224 the document “is converted into a word list and list of the positions of the words.” Judd provides no teaching as required in claim 6 of “intercepting an index request from the search engine” and “in response, returning to the search engine a modified form of the requested set of information.” Instead, the “process of FIG. 2 is undertaken after index 16 is constructed” (see. col. 8, lines 54-55) not to control the content that can be searched by the search engine in response to search requests. Hence, Judd does not overcome the deficiencies of Chidlovskii and Rubert, and claim 6 is allowable over these three references.

C. Rejection of Claim 7-13 under 103(a) based on Perkins in View of Rubert is Improper

Independent claim 7 is directed to a method for restricting access to content files by a search engine that calls for “positioning a search engine interface between the client and the search engine, wherein the search engine interface is also positioned between the search engine and the content files.” The search engine interface then receives “an indexing request from the search engine for a set of information from the content files.” Significantly, the method further includes the two steps of “operating the search engine interface to retrieve the set of information from the content files” and then “modifying content in the set of information with the search engine interface.” The method of claim 7 requires that the search engine interface act as a

intermediary between the search engine and the content files (no direct access provided as was the case in prior art systems) and is then able to control what “content” is returned to the search engine for use in “populating a search engine collections.” Because all of these features are not shown or even suggested by the combination of Perkins and Rubert, independent claim 7 is non-obvious based on the combination of these references.

In the Response to Arguments, the Final Office Action states that it is well known in the art that the software program has an API and that it is needed to communicate with a software program. However, the Response to Arguments does not point to Perkins or Rubert to show that an interface is positioned between a search engine and a set of content files or that such an interface would be used to limit what content or how content is indexed in the search engines collections. In the last Amendment, Appellants traversed the Examiner’s taking of what appeared to be Official Notice of this feature of the claimed invention. In the Appellants’ specification beginning at page 2, line 20, Appellants make it clear that search engines are typically provided direct access to content files for use in building indexed collections for use in responding to client search requests. The Final Office Action’s assertion that placing a restrictive interface between content files and a search engine even an API is known in the art directly contradicts Appellants’ knowledge of the state of the art at the time the application was filed.

The Advisory Action cites an IEEE dictionary definition of an interface as being useful for “passing information” between two components. However, the dictionary definition does not teach that an interface must be provided between a search engine and a data collection or that such an interface can be used to restrict access rather than just allowing information to be passed. An interface may be provided in a standard search engine but that does not restrict access to a data collection and instead most likely facilitates full access to all data in the data collection. Hence, a definition of a typical interface does not overcome the deficiencies of Perkins and Rubert.

In the Final Office Action, Perkins is cited at col., 1, lines 59-61 and col. 6, lines 1-3 for teaching positioning a search interface between a search engine and content files. However, Perkins teaches providing a standard interface such as a Common Gateway Interface (CGI) between the client (which sends the “query”) and the search engine but not an interface between the search engine and the content files. Note, the “search engine database” described at col. 6, lines 1-3 is a search engine collections so this citation also discusses a CGI between a client and a search engine used for allowing a user to add to, modify, or delete information in the search engine collections (but not for controlling interactions between a search engine and content files used to populate the collections). Hence, the positioning step of claim 7 is not shown or suggested.

Perkins is cited at col. 10, lines 27-67 for teaching operating the search engine interface to retrieve the set of information from the content files. However, at this citation, Perkins is discussing how to update the search engine database and search engine index using a CGI program (i.e., which was positioned between the client and the search engine). There is no teaching that the search engine when populating its collections or database would go through a search engine interface that would retrieve information identified in an indexing request from content files (typically in a manner that is transparent to the search engine).”

The Final Office Action noted that Perkins does not teach modifying content in the retrieved set of information with the search interface engine but cites Rubert at Figs. 6A-6B, 610, 615 (instead of the Christensen reference). Rubert provides no teaching of modifying data retrieved from a content source prior to placing it in the search engine collections, and hence, there would be no motivation to modify Perkins to arrive at the invention of claim 7. More particularly, Rubert in the method shown in Figures 6A and 6B is discussing query execution and presenting report forms and query selections from a user (see items 610 and 615 in particular). Rubert does not discuss the populating of databases served by database servers 350, 352, 354 with an intermediary device like the search interface engine. Instead, Rubert teaches

controlling access to the databases after they are created by only allowing certain queries to be selected by a user (which would be more like controlling access to the search engine collections rather than the search engine to the content). The claimed invention in contrast provides protection of content in files 150 of Figure 1 by limiting what a search engine can access in creating search engine collections 166. This is a very different tactic in providing limited user access – in the claimed invention, some data is not even made available to the searching tool (such as the IR system 300 of Figure 3 in Rubert). Additionally, the dictionary definition of a standard interface does not overcome the deficiencies of Perkins and Rubert. For at least this reason, claim 7 is believed allowable over the combination of Perkins and Rubert.

Claims 8-13 depend from independent claim 7 and are believed allowable for the reasons for allowing claim 7. Further, claim 11 calls for modifying the search request by operating the search engine interface in a fashion similar to that described in claim 1 to add a client search profile to a received search request to identify which portions of a search engine collections to apply the modified search request. Hence, claim 11, and claim 12 that depends from claim 11, is allowable over these combined references for the additional reasons provided for allowing claim 1.

D. Rejection of Claim 14-20 under 103(a) based on Judd in View of Rubert is Improper

Independent claim 14 is directed to a web server with limitations similar to those of claim 1 written in apparatus form. Hence, claim 14 and claims 15-17 that depend from claim 14 are believed allowable at least for the reasons for allowing claim 1.

Independent claim 18 includes limitations similar to that of the method of claim 7 written in computer program and code devices language. Therefore, the reasons provided for allowing claim 7 are applicable to claim 18. Particularly, the computer program of claim 18 includes code devices for creating a modified search request by applying a search profile, which is not shown by Judd or Rubert. Further,

the computer program includes code devices for intercepting an index request from the search engine and generating a restricted populating set of information by modifying the results of the indexing request. The search engine then uses this restricted set to populate the search engine collections.

Rubert provides no teaching of limiting the population of its databases but instead limits a user's ability to query such databases. Hence, claim 18 is believed allowable as non-obvious in light of Judd and Rubert. Claims 19 and 20 depend from Claim 18 and are believed allowable for the reasons for allowing Claim 18 and as depending on an allowable base claim.

More particularly, the Response to Arguments section of the Final Office Action states that Rubert teaches modifying a search request by limiting the search request to which database can be accessed by the user and since the query is restricted, "of course the search result will have a restricted population from restricted database." But, as discussed with regard to claim 1, Rubert teaches a system using a user's identification to identify which databases can be accessed by the user and which queries can be executed. The Rubert system then "presents the user with available queries" and the user must select one of the queries, and the user must actively select which queries (or forms, reports, and the like) they wish to receive. Nothing in Rubert explicitly or implicitly suggests that the user is submitting a search request that is modified by adding something from the profile, but instead, the profile is used to identify the databases and how they may be queried. These are different processes, which indicates that Rubert does not overcome the deficiencies of Judd.

E. Rejection of Claim 22 under 103(a) based on Chidlovskii is Improper

Claim 22 includes a combination of limitations of claims 1 and 7. The Final Office Action used the combined teaching of Rubert and Chidlovskii to reject claim 1 and the combined teaching of Perkins and Rubert to reject claim 7. Chidlovskii alone cannot, even using the assertions of the Examiner, teach or suggest every limitation of this "combined" claim that includes limitations of both claims. Further, Appellants

believe that even if Chidlovskii, Rubert, and Perkins were combined, claim 22 would be allowable for the reasons provided for allowing claims 1 and 7.

In the Final Office Action, Chidlovskii was cited at Figures 1-2, col. 2, lines 49 to col. 3, line 6 for teaching all the elements of claim 22 except selecting a set of search engine collections based on a service identification added to a search request. This step was said to be obvious based on knowledge of those skilled in the art with the teaching of Chidlovskii.

However, Chidlovskii fails to teach several of the elements of claim 22. Claim 22 calls for “modifying the retrieved set of information with the search interface to include service identifications.” Chidlovskii fails to teach the concept of populating the search engine collections with modifications to include service identifications (and beginning at col. 2, line 49 discusses what occurs after a search request is received – i.e., after the point at which a search engine collection would be populated).

Additionally, Appellants do not agree with the Examiner’s assertion that it would be obvious to modify Chidlovskii to modify search requests to limit/filter which search engine collections may be searched based on a client search profile. As discussed with reference to claim 1, Chidlovskii does not teach modifying the search profile so it would not be obvious to add a modification step to the teachings of Chidlovskii and, particularly, the modification step called for in claim 22 useful for filtering which information is accessible by a user based on their profile. Because Chidlovskii fails to suggest at least these two elements, claim 22 is believed in condition for allowance.

In the Final Office Action, the Response to Arguments asserts “Chidlovskii teaches modifying search request to limit which community is appropriate to the search.” However, no citation was provided and at col. 2, lines 33-64, Chidlovskii teaches creating a context for a search by “comparing the terms in the search query with a predetermined user context profile.” The “search query” is then used by the

search engine in performing the search, with no discussion of modification, and the “context” is used by the post-processor in determining results ranking. There is no teaching in Chidlovskii of limiting access to the community documents or that the search engines are blocked from freely accessing the community documents to build their indexed collections. In the Advisory Action, the Examiner cited Chidlovskii at col. 4, lines 58-65 and at col. 3, lines 16-22, but Chidlovskii at these citations and elsewhere fails to teach modifying search requests to limit access to content files or to collections searched by a search engine. Claim 22 is not taught or suggested by Chidlovskii.

Conclusion

In view of all of the above, claims 1-20 and 22 are believed to be allowable and the case in condition for allowance. Appellants respectfully request that the Examiner’s rejections be overturned.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 2/04/04



Kent A. Lembke, Reg. No. 44,866
HOGAN & HARTSON LLP
Phone: (720) 406-5378
Fax: (720) 406-5301



IX. APPENDIX OF CLAIMS ON APPEAL

1. A method for controlling access provided to a client to content files during an information search based on a client search profile, comprising:

receiving a search request from a client;

creating a modified search request by applying a search profile for the client to the received search request; and

routing the modified search request to a search engine having a search engine collections populated from the content files;

wherein the applying of the search profile includes adding at least a portion of the search profile to the received search request to specify a set of the search engine collections to be searched by the search engine with the modified search request.

2. The method of claim 1, wherein the creating of the modified search request includes generating the search profile based on stored information pertaining to the client.

3. The method of claim 2, wherein the generating includes accessing the stored client information using login information for the client, the login information being collected prior to the receiving of the search request.

4. The method of claim 1, further including in response to routing the modified search request, receiving a set of search results in a format defined by the search engine and including standardizing the set of search results.

5. The method of claim 4, further including generating a results page including the standardized set of search results for transmittal to the client.

6. The method of claim 1, further including prior to the receiving of the search request, intercepting an indexing request from the search engine for a set of information from the content for the search engine collections and in response, returning to the search engine a modified form of the requested set of information.

7. A method for restricting direct access to content files by a search engine and a client during an information search initiated by the client and performed by the search engine, comprising:

positioning a search engine interface between the client and the search engine, wherein the search engine interface is also positioned between the search engine and the content files;

receiving with the search engine interface an indexing request from the search engine for a set of information from the content files;

operating the search engine interface to retrieve the set of information from the content files;

modifying content in the set of information with the search engine interface;

passing the modified set of information to the search engine for use in populating a search engine collections;

receiving at the search engine interface a search request from the client; and

routing the search request to the search engine for use in searching the search engine collections.

8. The method of claim 7, wherein the modifying includes removing metatags from at least a portion of the set of information.

9. The method of claim 7, wherein the modifying includes adding additional information to the set of information.

10. The method of claim 7, wherein the received search request includes a client search profile defining select collections in the search engine collections for applying the search request.

11. The method of claim 7, further including prior to the routing, modifying the search request by operating the search engine interface to add a client search profile to the received search request to identify select ones of the search engine collections for applying the search request.

12. The method of claim 11, wherein the modifying includes generating the client search profile including retrieving with the search engine interface user information for the client.

13. The method of claim 7, wherein the positioning includes constructing an instance of the search engine interface that is configured for communicating with the search engine.

14. A Web server for controlling access to content files during a network-based information search initiated by a remote client, the Web server being communicatively linked to a search engine with search engine collections and the content files, comprising:

a Web server application in communication with a data communications network configured for communicating with the communications network and for receiving a search request from the remote client; and

a search engine interface adapted for processing the search request to add a client search profile to the search request to define select collections in the search engine collections for applying the search request and for routing the processed search request to the search engine.

15. The Web server of claim 14, wherein the Web server is a HTTP Web server configured to support Java™ and the search engine interface comprises a Java™ API.

16. The Web server of claim 14, wherein the search engine interface is further adapted parsing a set of search results returned by the search engine in response to the routed search request to generate a standardized set of search results.

17. The Web server of claim 16, further comprising a page generator for generating a results page including the standardized set of search results, and wherein the Web server application is adapted for transmitting the results page over the communications network to the client.

18. A computer program for controlling access to content files during an information search initiated by a client and performed by a search engine, comprising:

first computer code devices configured to cause a computer to receive a search request from the client;

second computer code devices configured to cause a computer to create a modified search request by applying a search profile for the client to the received search request;

third computer code devices configured to cause a computer to route the modified search request to the search engine, the search engine being communicatively linked to a search engine collections populated with a set of information from the content files; and

fourth computer code devices configured to cause a computer to intercept an indexing request from the search engine for information from the content files and to generate a restricted populating set of information by modifying results of the indexing request, wherein the search engine uses the restricted populating set to populate the search engine collections;

wherein the search profile defines select ones of the search engine collections for applying the modified search request during the information search.

19. The computer program of claim 18, further including fifth computer code devices configured to cause a computer to generate the search profile based on client information.

20. The computer program of claim 18, further including fifth computer code devices configured to cause a computer to receive a set of search results from the search engine and to parse the set of search results into a standardized set of search results for inclusion in a results page.

21. (canceled)

22. A method for concurrently restricting direct access to content files by a search engine and a client during an information search initiated by the client and performed by the search engine, comprising:

positioning a search engine interface between the client and the search engine, wherein the search engine interface is also positioned between the search engine and the content files;

receiving with the search engine interface an indexing request from the search engine for a set of information from the content files;

operating the search engine interface to retrieve the set of information from the content files;

modifying the retrieved set of information with the search engine interface to include service identifications;

passing the modified set of information to the search engine for use in populating a search engine collections;

receiving at the search engine interface a search request from the client;

modifying the search request to add a particular service identification defined in a client search profile;

routing the modified search request to the search engine for use in searching the search engine collections, whereby the search engine compares the particular service identification to the service identifications to select a subset of the search engine collections for use in the searching.